

Dictated Nov. 7, ¹⁹²³ ~~when~~ when Cobb
said Com. would meet Nov/2 when
I would be Philadelphia. Not mailed
because by time written out, arrangements
been made for ~~an~~ informal conf.
Nov 9, & compromise then agreed on
in line with my last page which
Speer ~~for~~ framed, & can call
to meet Nov/7 when I can be
present.

The Board of Foreign Missions
of the
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
156 Fifth Avenue
New York

AJB:M

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

November 7, 1923.

The Rev. Eben B. Cobb, D.D.,
1103 Mary Street,
Elizabeth, New Jersey.

Dear Eben:

A long-standing and imperative engagement in Philadelphia will prevent my attending the meeting of the "Doctrinal Committee" of the Board next Monday. I therefore venture to write you that, after much reflection upon the questions that have been discussed thus far and particularly those that arose in the meeting of the Board last Monday, (the 5th), I hope that the Committee will renew its recommendation that the Report be adopted substantially as presented including the following part of numbered section 2: "All the members and officers of the Board unequivocally recognize that, having been appointed by the General Assembly as the authorized agency to represent the whole Church in its foreign missionary work, they should scrupulously discharge the duty entrusted to it in obedience to the instructions of the Assembly and in harmony with the constitution and doctrinal standards of the Church, including the teaching of the standards concerning the Bible as the Word of God the only infallible rule of faith and practice, the virgin birth, the deity, the atoning death, and the resurrection of our Lord". If I correctly understood the discussion, there was unanimous agreement upon this statement down to the word "Church", and the pending question is on the retention or excision of the words "including the teaching of the standards concerning the Bible as the Word of God the only infallible rule of faith and practice, the virgin birth, the deity, the atoning death, and the resurrection of our Lord". My reasons for hoping that these words will be retained are as follows:

First: I believe these teachings to be true, although I freely recognize that there are legitimate variations of interpretation and relative emphasis. Care was exercised in framing the statement to avoid phraseology that suggests particular theories or scholastic explanations, but the doctrines themselves I firmly hold. I do not see how they could be more simply stated and I can think of no reason why we should not say what we believe. If it is said that mentioning them will cause misunderstanding, I reply that failure to mention them will cause far more serious misunderstanding. If it be said that they "will alienate desirable candidates" I reply that candidates who do not accept these doctrines

are not "desirable", and that there would be gain rather than loss in having young people who are thinking of applying for missionary service know just where our Board stands. It would be far better to lose a few otherwise highly qualified candidates than to compromise our witness on these points.

Second: They are unquestionably taught in the Bible and in the standards of the Presbyterian Church. They are in the Confession of Faith, in the Longer Catechism, in the Shorter Catechism, and in the "Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith". To say therefore that one accepts "the doctrinal standards of the Church" but is not willing to accept the doctrines referred to is a contradiction of terms.

Third: To the question why it is necessary to single out a few of the many doctrines that are included in the standards of the Church, it seems to me that the sufficient reason lies in the fact that these particular doctrines are the ones around which the present controversy in the Church centers. Neither the Board nor any of its members is charged with disbelief in other doctrines, but charges are made that members of the Board do not believe these, that such alleged members "control the policy of the Board", and that the Board sends out and maintains missionaries who do not believe them. There appears to be no way of squarely meeting this criticism except to state unequivocally that the Board stands for these as well as the other doctrines in our standards.

Fourth: In the Board meeting last Monday, the statement was repeatedly made that the question was not as to the fact that the doctrines referred to are in our Church standards but only as to the expediency of mentioning them in the Board's statement. Dr. Alexander emphasized this from the Chair. If it were otherwise, that is to say, if any members of the Board did not believe them, the issue would be far different and it would be impertinent to ask them to vote for what they do not believe. If, however, the question is one of expediency, is it not reasonable to ask ~~them~~ those who are hesitating, to take into account the conviction of a large majority of the Board and of many of the friends of the cause in the churches that the published statement of them is urgently desirable. It probably would not satisfy a few extremists. Nothing that we could say would. But it would undoubtedly satisfy a large and increasing number of good people in the rank and file of the churches and thus allay apprehensions that are now causing great harm not merely to us but to the sacred cause that we represent. Refusal or evasion certainly would not allay these apprehensions but would, I fear, cause the continuance and probably the intensification of the opposition that has now developed. Grant that it is humiliating, as the Moderator of the General Assembly intimated in an address before the Synod of New Jersey, that men who have been long and prominently identified with the cause of Christ should have to make such a statement. Nevertheless it is plain that such a statement is needed, and that we should not allow any personal

considerations to prevent us from making it.

Fifth: Should we not seriously consider the point, made by Drs. Stevenson, Ewing and Patterson, that these doctrines are not only the heart of the present controversy but that if the Board does not voluntarily put them in, the next General Assembly will probably order them, and perhaps, in the heat of feeling, do so in a more drastic form. Some of those who spoke in the Board last Monday appeared to assume that it is within the discretion of the Board to determine whether or not the missionary work entrusted to ~~it~~ us by the General Assembly shall be conducted in harmony with these doctrines. I do not believe that the Board has any such discretion. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that these doctrines are tenaciously held by the overwhelming mass of the Presbyterian Church and that the General Assembly is likely to insist that the agencies which represent it and the whole Church shall be conducted in loyalty to them. We gain nothing therefore by striking these statements out, but we may lose much if we do. We should bear in mind that while the Presbyterian Church rightly gives wide latitude of thought and speech to its individual ministers and members, it naturally feels that an agency which represents the Church as a whole should be conducted in harmony with the position of the Church as a whole. The Board should avoid the danger of swinging to either extreme and thus placate one element in the Church by alienating another element. I am, as you know, far from being an ultra-conservative. I don't like these so-called "Fundamentalist" organizations. I indigantly recoil from the extremists who make a narrow, mechanical, reactionary interpretation of our Christian faith and intolerantly stigmatize as "rationalists" all who refuse to speak their shibboleth. I am distressed by the number of people, especially among the young, who are saying: "If that is orthodoxy, we will have none of it". But my recoil is equally strong from "radical" extremists at the opposite pole. It seems to me that we must stand unflinchingly for a sound evangelical gospel, free alike from both extremes.

While the position that I have indicated represents my clear personal conviction, nevertheless if it shall be found impossible to secure anything like a unanimous vote on this basis, might we not acquiesce in the excision of the words: "concerning the Bible as the Word of God the only infallible rule of faith and practice, the virgin birth, the deity, the atoning death, and the resurrection of our Lord", provided there can be agreement on substituting the words: "all the doctrines that are essential to the Confession of Faith as the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures". Such a statement would of course include the particular doctrines in question.

If, however, a unanimous vote cannot be secured even on this basis, why should not those who favor it vote for it, and those who feel that they cannot do so be asked to file a written statement of their reasons, to be published with the majority report.

The Rev. Eben B. Cobb, D.D. -----4.

This would prevent misapprehension as to the position of any member of the Board, and set everyone right before the public.

Well, well! These are truly anxious days. May God guide us aright!

Affectionately yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

AJB:M

November 7, 1923.

The Rev. Eben B. Cobb, D.D.,
1103 Mary Street,
Elizabeth, New Jersey.

Dear Eben:

A long-standing and imperative engagement in Philadelphia will prevent my attending the meeting of the "Doctrinal Committee" of the Board next Monday. I therefore venture to write you that, after much reflection upon the questions that have been discussed thus far and particularly those that arose in the meeting of the Board last Monday, (the 5th), I hope that the Committee will renew its recommendation that the Report be adopted substantially as presented including the following part of numbered section 2: "All the members and officers of the Board unequivocally recognize that, having been appointed by the General Assembly as the authorized agency to represent the whole Church in its foreign missionary work, they should scrupulously discharge the duty entrusted to it in obedience to the instructions of the Assembly and in harmony with the constitution and doctrinal standards of the Church, including the teaching of the standards concerning the Bible as the Word of God the only infallible rule of faith and practice, the virgin birth, the deity, the atoning death, and the resurrection of our Lord". If I correctly understood the discussion, there was unanimous agreement upon this statement down to the word "Church", and the pending question is on the retention or excision of the words "including the teaching of the standards concerning the Bible as the Word of God the only infallible rule of faith and practice, the virgin birth, the deity, the atoning death, and the resurrection of our Lord". My reasons for hoping that these words will be retained are as follows:

First: I believe these teachings to be true, although I freely recognize that there are legitimate variations of interpretation and relative emphasis. Care was exercised in framing the statement to avoid phraseology that suggests particular theories or scholastic explanations, but the doctrines themselves I firmly hold. I do not see how they could be more simply stated and I can think of no reason why we should not say what we believe. If it is said that mentioning them will cause misunderstanding, I reply that failure to mention them will cause far more serious misunderstanding. If it be said that they "will alienate desirable candidates" I reply that candidates who do not accept these doctrines

are not "desirable", and that there would be gain rather than loss in having young people who are thinking of applying for missionary service know just where our Board stands. It would be far better to lose a few otherwise highly qualified candidates than to compromise our witness on these points.

Second: They are unquestionably taught in the Bible and in the standards of the Presbyterian Church. They are in the Confession of Faith, in the Longer Catechism, in the Shorter catechism, and in the "Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith". To say therefore that one accepts "the doctrinal standards of the Church" but is not willing to accept the doctrines referred to is a contradiction of terms.

Third: To the question why it is necessary to single out a few of the many doctrines that are included in the standards of the Church, it seems to me that the sufficient reason lies in the fact that these particular doctrines are the ones around which the present controversy in the Church centers. Neither the Board nor any of its members is charged with disbelief in other doctrines, but charges are made that members of the Board do not believe these, that such alleged members "control the policy of the Board", and that the Board sends out and maintains missionaries who do not believe them. There appears to be no way of squarely meeting this criticism except to state unequivocally that the Board stands for these as well as the other doctrines in our standards.

Fourth: In the Board meeting last Monday, the statement was repeatedly made that the question was not as to the fact that the doctrines referred to are in our Church standards but only as to the expediency of mentioning them in the Board's statement. Dr. Alexander emphasized this from the Chair. If it were otherwise, that is to say, if any members of the Board did not believe them, the issue would be far different and it would be impertinent to ask them to vote for what they do not believe. If, however, the question is one of expediency, is it not reasonable to ask ~~them~~ those who are hesitating, to take into account the conviction of a large majority of the Board and of many of the friends of the cause in the churches that the published statement of them is urgently desirable. It probably would not satisfy a few extremists. Nothing that we could say would. But it would undoubtedly satisfy a large and increasing number of good people in the rank and file of the churches and thus allay apprehensions that are now causing great harm not merely to us but to the sacred cause that we represent. Refusal or evasion certainly would not allay these apprehensions but would, I fear, cause the continuance and probably the intensification of the opposition that has now developed. Grant that it is humiliating, as the Moderator of the General Assembly intimated in an address before the Synod of New Jersey, that men who have been long and prominently identified with the cause of Christ should have to make such a statement. Nevertheless it is plain that such a statement is needed, and that we should not allow any personal

considerations to prevent us from making it.

Fifth: Should we not seriously consider the point, made by Drs. Stevenson, Ewing and Patterson, that these doctrines are not only the heart of the present controversy but that if the Board does not voluntarily put them in, the next General Assembly will probably order them, and perhaps, in the heat of feeling, do so in a more drastic form. Some of those who spoke in the Board last Monday appeared to assume that it is within the discretion of the Board to determine whether or not the missionary work entrusted to ~~it~~ us by the General Assembly shall be conducted in harmony with these doctrines. I do not believe that the Board has any such discretion. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that these doctrines are tenaciously held by the overwhelming mass of the Presbyterian Church and that the General Assembly is likely to insist that the agencies which represent it and the whole Church shall be conducted in loyalty to them. We gain nothing therefore by striking these statements out, but we may lose much if we do. We should bear in mind that while the Presbyterian Church rightly gives wide latitude of thought and speech to its individual ministers and members, it naturally feels that an agency which represents the Church as a whole should be conducted in harmony with the position of the Church as a whole. The Board should avoid the danger of swinging to either extreme and thus placate one element in the Church by alienating another element. I am, as you know, far from being an ultra-conservative. I don't like these so-called "Fundamentalist" organizations. I indigantly recoil from the extremists who make a narrow, mechanical, reactionary interpretation of our Christian faith and intolerantly stigmatize as "rationalists" all who refuse to speak their shibboleth. I am distressed by the number of people, especially among the young, who are saying: "If that is orthodoxy, we will have none of it". But my recoil is equally strong from "radical" extremists at the opposite pole. It seems to me that we must stand unflinchingly for a sound evangelical gospel, free alike from both extremes.

While the position that I have indicated represents my clear personal conviction, nevertheless if it shall be found impossible to secure anything like a unanimous vote on this basis, might we not acquiesce in the excision of the words: "concerning the Bible as the Word of God the only infallible rule of faith and practice, the virgin birth, the deity, the atoning death, and the resurrection of our Lord", provided there can be agreement on substituting the words: "all the doctrines that are essential to the Confession of Faith as the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures". Such a statement would of course include the particular doctrines in question.

If, however, a unanimous vote cannot be secured even on this basis, why should not those who favor it vote for it, and those who feel that they cannot do so be asked to file a written statement of their reasons, to be published with the majority report.

The Rev. Eben B. Cobb, D.D. -----4.

This would prevent misapprehension as to the position of any member of the Board, and set everyone right before the public.

Well, well! These are truly anxious days. May God guide us aright!

Affectionately yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

7 (A)
At its meeting on December 18th, 1893, in connection with its action on the resignation of the Rev. E. B. McGilvary, of the Laos Mission, the Board adopted a statement beginning with the following declaration:

First: The Board has but one rule in reference to cases involving doctrinal or ecclesiastical questions; namely, to refer them to the Presbytery to which the missionary concerned belongs. In the only similar case which has occurred in the last twenty years, the question of the doctrinal views of the missionary concerned was simply referred to his presbytery. This rule should exempt the Board from all difficulties and discussions in such matters. It regards its function as that of an Executive Body charged with the propagation of the Gospel under the direction of the General Assembly, its missionaries being subject to their presbyteries in all doctrinal or ecclesiastical matters.

AJB:H

May 2, 1922.

The Rev. George P. Pierson, D.D.,
926 North Broad St.,
Elizabeth, N. J.

My dear Dr. Pierson:

I had pleasure in presenting the question of your extension of furlough to the Board at its meeting yesterday and now write that the following action was promptly taken:

"The furlough and home allowance of the Rev. Dr. and Mrs. George P. Pierson, of the Japan Mission, were extended from July 27 to September 15 on a medical certificate to the effect that this extension is necessary for health reasons."

I hope most heartily that this further opportunity for rest and recuperation will bring you into fine condition for your return to your work in Japan.

This morning's mail brings your letter of April 29. I dropped some other matters to give it an immediate reading, and I expect to read it again when I can do so more deliberately than the crowded office work of this day permits. It is good to know that there is no essential difference of opinion between us on any fundamental questions. You will recall that I said in our interview the other day that I decidedly disavow and repudiate the construction which some persons have placed on certain passages of my book, "The Mastery of the Far East." If you are interested in my personal views you will find them expressed on page 59 of my book, "Unity and Missions", and particularly on pages 109-140, entitled, "The Accepted Essentials of Christianity". I believe very heartily in the virgin birth and deity of our Lord, and in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God the only infallible rule of faith and practice. It is an amazement to me that anyone should have circulated misleading statements regarding the position of the Board and its Secretaries.

Cordially yours,

Charles E. Scott

AJB:K

December 7, 1923.

The Rev. John F. Patterson, D.D.,
70 Main Street,
Orange, New Jersey.

Dear John:

As you are Chairman of the Committee to consider what should be done for missionaries who are spreading unfavorable reports regarding "modernism", I enclose copies of the following correspondence so that you may know beforehand some of the details:

1. My letter of Nov. 26 to Dr. Chas. E. Scott, of Shangung.
2. Copy of the printed statement regarding the North China Theological Seminary which Dr. Scott is circulating and the attached personal note which he has sent with it and which was sent to me by a friendly pastor who had received it directly from Dr. Scott.
3. Letter of Nov. 15 from Dr. Swain, of Philadelphia, to Miss Hodge.
4. Extract from the "Presbyterian" of Nov. 1 regarding Pyengyang College.

Other material could be sent but this may suffice.

As I am sending you my only copies will you kindly return them in the enclosed stamped and addressed envelope.

Cordially yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

ENC.

AJB:K

January 18, 1924.

- ✓ Rev. Dr. John F. Patterson, Chairman.
- ✓ Rev. Dr. Eben B. Cobb.
- ✓ Rev. Dr. J. Ross Stevenson.
- ✓ Wm. E. Stiger, Esq.,
- ✓ Miss Margaret E. Hodge.
- ✓ Mrs. Caleb S. Green.

Dear Friends:

The Committee of the Board to consider doctrinal matters, of which you are members, is requested to meet in my office next Monday, January 21, at eleven o'clock, to consider certain questions of grave moment on which the Executive Council desires your advice.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

K sent this by mistake to Patterson's Com. appointed Dec 3 instead of Cobb's appointed Sept 24. The 5 members checked are on both Committees. Ewing & Alexander are on Cobb's Com. & I notified them in attached letter. I did not recall Mrs. Green's notice as she knew Perkins case which was chief business

Confidential

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCUKATE" New York

TELEPHONE
822 GRAMERCY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.
156 Fifth Avenue
NEW YORK

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

B/C

April 29th, 1914.

The Rev. John Fox, D.D.,
Bible House,
Astor Place,
New York City.

*Not mailed as he called
me on 'phone and I covered
this ground in the conver-
sation.*

My dear Dr. Fox:

For various reasons with which I need not burden you, I was under heavy nervous strain this morning when your telephone call came. As I recall our conversation some hours later, I fear that my remarks were characterized by more heat than should have characterized them.

Absence from the city had prevented my seeing until this morning your letter of April 23rd and I was astounded by the construction which you placed upon my remark during our conversation with Dr. White and Dr. Erdman after the last meeting of the Board, and I felt it necessary to disavow that construction with considerable emphasis. I confess that I feel rather indignant, my dear Dr. Fox, that you should have supposed for a moment that my position and that of my colleagues was doubtful on questions which involve a departure from evangelical teaching. The personal position of the Secretaries of this Board is in full accord with the statement which we drew up in 1910 and which the Board adopted by special vote March 7th of that year, a declaration which was reported to the General Assembly's Standing Committee on Foreign Missions the following May. You will find this statement on pages 183-184 of my printed "Report on a Second Visit to China, Japan and Korea." Copies were sent to the Stated Clerks of all Presbyteries in America and to all our missionaries.

I was part way through my dictation of this letter when a messenger brought your letter of today. I am glad to note some statements that you make in it, but it does not fully relieve my mind. For example, you state that your "letter of the 23rd was meant to point out that to be non-committal on the virgin birth and reliability of the Gospels was to open the door for Unitarianism". To which I reply that we are not "non-committal on the virgin birth and reliability of the Gospels"; not do I admit that my "refusal" to be examined by you on doctrinal matters "left it fairly open to the conclusion" that I was "evasive" or "hedging", as you charged after the Board meeting, and as you intimate in your letters of the 23rd and 29th.

I would be sorry to disturb those relations of personal friendship which have long subsisted between us, and I do not wish anything that I have said to be understood as desiring to terminate it. But I feel rather keenly, and I know that my colleagues and some at least in the Board feel with equal keenness, your apparent assumption that every one who does not agree with you is tainted with heresy, your questioning the evangelical soundness of men who are doing far more than you to preach Christ as the Divine and only Saviour of men, your apparent determination to force our Board into factional theological disputes between parties of recognized standing within the Presbyterian Church, your frequent opposition in the Board to the settled policies that have been approved by the General Assembly and the common opinion of the Church and the missionary body, and the impossibility of having any discussion with you without subjecting oneself to the danger of misinterpretation and suspicion. The situation has become intolerable, and I know that my opinion is held by many other conservative men both in and out of the Board. Of course you believe that you are doing God service; but your spirit and methods are doing immeasurable harm to the very cause that you wish to advance. A good cause can suffer no greater injury than an advocacy so unwise and impracticable as to dishearten its friends, alienate support that it would otherwise have, prejudice it in the public mind, and gratify and reenforce its enemies by leading multitudes to say "If that is orthodoxy, we will have none of it."

I do not wish to be unduly severe, but your course compels these candid statements. And I am frankly saying directly to you what hosts of conservative men are feeling and saying about you.

Sincerely yours,

The Board of Foreign Missions
of the

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

156 Fifth Avenue

New York

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

AJB:H

April 28, 1921.

*Not mailed but
written for my
own satisfaction*

The Rev. John Fox, D.D.
Easton, Pa.

My dear Dr. Fox:

I am puzzled to understand why you should be so intent on misrepresenting me. I am quite willing to be held responsible for a fair interpretation of anything that I have written, but I naturally object to having my statements distorted. The Presbyterian of April 14 printed my repudiation of the construction that, in its issue of March 31, you placed upon certain passages in my book "The Mastery of the Far East", but in your article of April 21, while professing to accept that repudiation, you proceed to make further misleading statements.

For example, you give the distinct impression that I spoke disparagingly of the early missionaries in Korea. You mention Dr. Underwood and Dr. Moffett, and ask: "Is it possible that the secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions meant to characterize such men in such terms as he uses?" Since when was it a reproach to speak of a Christian worker as a "man of a Puritan type", keeping the Sabbath strictly, and "in theology and biblical criticism strongly conservative" as well as "premillenarian"? One would have supposed that you of all men would have counted that a compliment. Why do you put a bad construction upon my words and ignore what I said in praise of the missionaries on pages 500-510, 520, 522, while on pages 550-551 I gave special praise to Dr. Underwood? Was it candid in you to attempt to prejudice me in the estimation of the friends of these beloved missionaries by alleging that I gave an "unflattering not to say contemptuous portraiture"?

You also gave your readers the impression that I "belabor" the Korean Christians because I referred to them as "unsophisticated believers," "trustful as little children, and accepting the Bible in its most literal sense from Genesis to Revelation". Apart from the consideration that any dictionary would have told you that the word "unsophisticated" has a good meaning, and that you omitted the words "happy" and "radiant," I might inquire whether you think that Christ was speaking contemptuously when He said: "Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven." When you quoted a few lines from page 540, why did you not also quote from the next sentence the words: "Nowhere else in the world is there a higher percentage of church members who pray, study the Bible, attend devotional services, give proportionately of their money, and manifest evangelistic

zeal in spreading the gospel"? And why did you ignore my whole chapter on "Korean Christians" (pp. 524-538), the last paragraph of which begins: "For myself, I cannot withhold the tribute of my confidence and love for the Korean Christians", and the closing sentences are: "As we bowed together in a closing prayer, my heart went out to them as to those who, with fewer advantages than I had enjoyed, had never-the-less learned more than I of the deep things of God. Childlike? Yes, they are; but it was the Master himself who said to his disciples, and through them to us all: "Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."

While in your second article you acquit me of denying "essential or important doctrines", you assert that I am a "Broad Churchman" "who is willing to admit into the holy ministry those who do deny them," and that I have "a set purpose of tolerating rationalism or semi-rationalism in Korea, in China, in Japan, and in New York also". Is your memory at fault, or are you so determined to find fault with me that you are disposed to select only those passages which, taken out of their connection, can in your judgment be made to support your accusation? At any rate, I know that you are familiar with my book "Unity and Missions", for you quoted several passages from it in an article published a few years ago. Why then do you now leave out of account not only that there is a whole chapter on "The Accepted Essentials of Christianity", but in another chapter (p. 59-60) there are the following sentences:

"Emphasis should be laid upon the statement that unity does not involve compromise of essential truth or weakening of the evangelical message. I have no sympathy with any effort to attain unity by watering down truth or by eliminating any part of it which a rationalist finds troublesome. I know that there are reverent men who are earnestly trying to serve God and their fellow men without recognizing Jesus Christ as Lord. The personal friendship of some of these men is highly prized. But in matters of the Church, the line must be clearly drawn between those who believe in a supernatural religion and those who do not, between those who believe that the Bible is the Word of God and those who regard it as merely a human book, between those who worship Christ as the divine Saviour of the world and those who see in Him only the best man that ever lived. These cleavages are too wide and deep for any possible bridging. I am discussing in this book the unity of those who hold what is popularly termed the evangelical faith, and nothing that is said should be interpreted as implying any disposition to go beyond it. Unity has its limitations. So far from endangering evangelical truth, the union of evangelical Christians would guard it more securely. The imperious question of this age is, not

whether one denomination can make out a better case than another, but whether we have a Gospel that "is the power of God unto salvation." Urgent is the need that all who believe that we have such a Gospel should get together on this new alignment against those who doubt or deny that we have such a message to the world."

Both you and Dr. Kennedy appear to agree that I have "fully acknowledged that modern rationalism has made its appearance among missionaries in Korea" because I made the statement (p.540) that "the few men who hold the modern view have a rough road to travel, particularly in the Presbyterian group of Missions." Surely it should have occurred to you that I did not use the term "modern view" as synonymous with the denial of evangelical doctrines, and that I had in mind nothing more than those variations of theological statement and biblical interpretation that are held by large numbers of Presbyterian ministers who are in good standing in many home presbyteries, some of whom have been Moderators of the General Assembly: views, too, that are taught in more than one of the theological seminaries that are under the direct care of the General Assembly.

I am not writing with any thought of publication. I would not take the trouble to write at all if nothing but my personal position were involved, but in view of the fact that some readers of The Presbyterian have not seen my books, and may think that a Secretary of our Board has taken the positions that you allege, with reflex injury to our missionary work. May I not express my confidence, my dear Dr. Fox, that you will withdraw the injurious and unjust statements that you have made. I am at a loss to understand why you and Dr. Kennedy, whom I always supposed to be my personal friends in spite of our differences on some questions, should now be making such uncalled-for personal attacks.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur H. Brown

AJB:K

November 21, 1923.

The Rev. D. S. Kennedy, D.D.,
1217 Market Street,
Philadelphia, Penn.

My dear Dr. Kennedy:

* 2 You doubtless received from our office by this morning's mail a copy of a "Statement Regarding the Evangelical Loyalty of the Board of Foreign Missions and the Missionaries". As "The Presbyterian" has devoted considerable space to criticisms of the Board and its policy and as we have not until now asked for any space in reply, we feel sure that you will deem it only fair and just to print this statement in full. You will understand from its character how unwilling we are that extracts should be made from it. We would rather pay for its full insertion at advertising rates than have any part of it omitted. We are thinking not of the Board but of friends of Foreign Missions in the churches, some of whom have been disturbed by the charges that have been published and who are entitled to hear both sides of the question. Still more important, however, are the interests of the devoted missionaries on the field. I am puzzled by your frequent suggestion that "the best plan is to send funds directly to the missions for their own support". I feel confident that you will realize on reflection that 1600 missionaries and their families, in far distant lands, who require ~~over~~ \$4,000,000. a year for their maintenance and the support of their work, cannot possibly go on if they must depend upon individual gifts sent directly to the field - gifts which from the nature of the case would be scattered, irregular, in insufficient volume, and unequally applied so that while a few of the better known missionaries might receive more than they need, the great majority would receive less and some none at all. The stability of the missionaries' support and the maintenance of their work depend upon the guaranteed appropriations of the Board. Anything, therefore, that diverts money from the Board does not penalize the members of the Board, who receive no personal benefit whatever, but simply lessens the amount which the Board can appropriate to the missionaries who are therefore the real sufferers. In your issue of November 15 you say that "Dr. Wilson speaks very highly of the Presbyterian missionaries, and says with very few exceptions they are thoroughly loyal to the Presbyterian Standards and to the faith and teaching common to the evangelical churches". Is it right therefore to inflict personal privation upon these missionaries and their families and to demoralize their work because some people at home are not satisfied with three or four of the forty members of the Board? If the Church is not satisfied with the personnel or the policy of the Board, the General Assembly which appointed it has full power to change either or both; but for the sake of beloved and devoted men and women of God who are giving their lives to represent the Church at the forefront of the world's great spiritual battle field, let us unitedly stand by them.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

Not mailed. Scott & Schell approved sending it, but White, Stevenson & J. H. Lee doubted

AJB:M

April 17, 1922.

The Rev. David S. Kennedy, D.D.,
1217 Market Street,
Philadelphia, Pa.

My dear Dr. Kennedy:-

In compliance with your request of April 13 I enclose an article of the approximate length you mention for the General Assembly number of The Presbyterian.

It is not my custom to reply to personal criticisms, but lest you may deem it odd that I make no reference to them in a letter that I must write you anyway, I depart so far from my custom as to say that in the revised edition of my book "The Why and How of Foreign Missions" the reason why I omitted a reference in the first edition to the efforts to retain the Bible in mission schools in Japan in 1899 was because I had just used that illustration in a fuller form in my larger book "The Mastery of the Far East" (see chapter entitled "Japanese Nationalism and Mission Schools, pages 586 sq.) and I therefore did not deem it necessary to repeat it in the subsequent edition of "The Why and How of Foreign Missions", especially as the insertion of considerable new matter compelled me to cut out every practicable paragraph from the old edition in order to keep the revised edition within text book limits. There has been no change of policy, as my chapter in The Mastery of the Far East clearly shows.

The tribute that I paid to the Korean Christians, on pages 524-538 in "The Mastery of the Far East", should suffice to prove that I did not intend any disparaging reference to them in the following chapter on "Types and Problems of Korean Religious Thought". What I said in the latter chapter regarding their theological convictions is literally true, but I utterly and emphatically disclaim the inferences regarding my own alleged views which some persons have imagined that they read between the lines. I was simply trying to bring out the thought that the type of Korean religious thought-- well, if I may now use a more concrete illustration-- the type of Korean religious thought more nearly resembles that of the Los Angeles Bible Institute and the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago than that of some of the officially recognized theological seminaries of the Presbyterian Church in America. It was far from

my thought to intimate that there is any other kind of "liberalism" or "modernism" in Korea, or in any other of our Mission fields, than that which is represented not only by large numbers of ministers at home in good standing in their respective presbyteries, but that is taught in theological seminaries that annually report to our General Assembly and that are under its direct care as authorized institutions for the training of ministers for the home and foreign fields. Of course I did not mean to imply that such teaching is unevangelical. If you are interested in my personal opinions, you will find them in my book The Foreign Missionary (pages 13 sq., 29 sq., and 177 sq.) and particularly on pages 59-60 of my book "Unity and Missions", where I define my attitude toward an unevangelical rationalism, and more fully in the chapter on "The Accepted Essentials of Christianity" on pages 109-139. Our Board and its official staff, as well as our missionary body on the field, stand as firmly as ever for "The Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice" and for the sound evangelical Gospel as that Gospel is understood by the presbyterian Church.

This is a personal letter written with no desire for publication.

Sincerely yours,

Enc.

JAN 21 1921

537
SECRETARIES

AJB:H

January 18, 1920.

The Rev. D.S. Kennedy, D.D.,
1014 Witherspoon Building,
Philadelphia, Pa.

My dear Dr. Kennedy:

The heavy pressure of missionary committees and missionary work have prevented me from acknowledging until today your letter of January 7. I have no disposition that anything should "be kept quiet". It is simply an established rule of mine not to wage a public controversy in a newspaper in reply to personal criticisms. My only thought was to acquaint you as a personal friend with certain facts. I have no "outside duties" in the sense that the term implies, I am maintaining the full work of a large department in the Board and the so-called "outside duties" relate to those matters which directly concern the interests of the work of Foreign Missions either at home or abroad, or those related responsibilities in which every Presbyterian minister is under solemn obligation to give such assistance as he can consistently with his regular work and all of which in my opinion are incurred with the judgment of the General Assembly. If you will refer to pp 101-104 of the Minutes of the last meeting of the General Assembly, you find its most recent deliverances regarding the Federal Council, including the following statement on page 101: "Action upon matters connected with the needs of the churches of Europe during the World War or since, are recognized as necessary on the part of the Council".

As to the question "by what authority I went to

Europe last summer?" If you will refer to pp 104-106 of the Assembly's Minutes you will note not only the strong approval given to the World Conference on Faith and Order, but the specific appointment of "delegates" to the preliminary conference to meet at Geneva, Switzerland, August 12, 1920". As none of the delegates there named were able to go, the General Assembly's Commission on Church Cooperation and Union, of which the late Dr. William Henry Roberts was Chairman, appointed me as a delegate and I received a formal commission signed by Dr. Roberts.

As for my visit to the Protestant churches of Hungary, if you will refer to the Assembly's Minutes on pp 137-139 you will find not only that the Board of Foreign Mission was

appointed Treasurer of the fund "for the aid of Protestant churches in Europe", and a member of the Committee, jointly with the other parties named, but you will find on pp 138-139 the following specific authorization regarding the special Deputation:

"That with a view to obtain a clear understanding of the situation respecting Protestantism in Hungary, Bohemia, Czecho-Slovakia and Transylvania, and to discover what means should be adopted to secure the maintenance, continuity and freedom of worship in these historic Churches, we respectfully suggest the urgent necessity of sending to those countries a qualified special Commission composed of representatives of the several Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of America with whom the Reformed and Calvinistic Churches in East Europe are kindred in faith and polity; and that in case this is done, that the Executive Commission of our Church be authorized to appoint a Commissioner to be a member of said Commission. We also respectfully suggest that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ be invited to act with the various Presbyterian and Reformed Churches in furthering the end sought."

Acting under this authority the General Assembly's Committee appointed me to visit the Reformed churches in Hungary, and gave me particular charge regarding the questions that had risen between the Conventus and the Hungarian churches in America. I was not alone in this for other members of the Deputation from our Church were, the Rev. D. E. Lorenz and the Rev. L. Harsanyi both of our Church. If you will refer to the proceedings of the last meeting of the Executive Committee of the Western Section of the Executive Committee of the World Alliance of the Presbyterian Churches, you will find that it formed a deputation of four to visit the Reformed Churches on the Continent, this Delegation consisting of Dr. James I. Good of the Reformed Church of the United States, Dr. S. H. Chester of the Southern Presbyterian Church, Dr. Bruce Taylor of the Canadian Presbyterian Church, and myself. Dr. Chester and Dr. Taylor were unable to go with us to Hungary, but Drs. Good, Lorenz, Harsanyi, and I were there to gether, discussed the Hungarian churches in America jointly, and the agreement to which you refer was drawn up by a committee of which Dr. Good was Chairman, and which he signed together with me; while Dr. Lorenz and Dr. Harsanyi also approved it. Whether the agreement was wise or unwise is, of course, a fair subject of discussion and criticism, but your question related to my right to deal with the matter at all.

You will also note on page 139 of the Assembly's Minutes that one of the recommendations of the Assembly's Special Committee on Work on the Continent of Europe, included the following sentence:

"We also respectfully suggest that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ be invited to act with the various Presbyterian and Reformed Churches in furthering the end sought."

In pursuance of this authority the Federal Council appointed all of the Presbyterians, including myself, who went to the Continent this summer as "friendly visitors" on its behalf.

This letter, like my former one, is not intended for publication.

Cordially yours,

AJB:M

December 28, 1920.

The Rev. David S. Kennedy, D.D.,
1217 Market St.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

My dear Dr. Kennedy:-

I do not wish to trouble you to publish any rejoinder statement about the recent editorial in The Presbyterian that "Dr. Arthur Brown spent much time and money in traversing Europe in the interest of political reconstruction". I simply want you to know as a personal friend that I went to Europe last summer under commission of the Western Section of the World Alliance of Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, our own General Assembly, and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America to attend religious conferences in Switzerland and to visit the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches in Austria and Hungary, whose sorrows and privations had deeply stirred the hearts of their brethren in America. Not one day was substracted from my office duties as Secretary of the Foreign Board. My ordinary vacation is five weeks, which is considerably shorter than the vacations of city pastors. This year, in kindly recognition of my twenty-fifth anniversary as a Secretary, the Board generously gave me ten weeks. Instead of spending that time resting, I devoted it to the duties assigned to me in Europe, working and travelling under heavy pressure and strain. Not a dollar of missionary money was used. I received nothing toward my expenses from the General Assembly or from the Federal Council, and the amount given me by the Western Section of the Alliance was less than half of my expenses.

As I have intimated, this is not for publication but simply for your personal information.

Cordially yours,

AJB:M

October 8, 1923

The Rev. John E. Williams, D.D.,
150 Fifth Avenue,
New York City.

Dear Dr. Williams:

I am grateful to you for telling me that you have heard of some concern as to the reason why, in the revised edition of my book "The Why and How of Foreign Missions", I omitted a reference in the first edition to the efforts that the missionaries and the Board made to retain the Bible in mission schools in Japan in 1899. The fact simply is that the Missionary Education Movement, under whose auspices the book was published, asked me in the new edition to add considerable new matter and to do this without increasing the size of the book, so that its practicability as a mission study class book would not be lessened. I therefore had to cut out much material which, in other circumstances, I would have retained. The illustration referred to was a part of the material that was thus deleted solely in the interest of space.

I was the more ready to omit this particular illustration because I had recently used it in a fuller form in another book, and I therefore did not deem it necessary to repeat it. The omission was not caused by any change of conviction or policy whatever. I stand, and the Board stands, exactly where we did originally.

If any one is interested in my personal opinions he may find them in my book, "Unity and Missions", where on pages 59-60 I define my attitude toward unevangelical rationalism, and on pages 109-139 I give at some length my understanding of the "accepted essentials of Christianity". The eleventh edition of my book "The Foreign Missionary" is now in press and the passages on pages 13sq., 29sq., and 177sq. stand unchanged.

I am so busy with the work which the Board, with the approval of the General Assembly, has laid upon me that I seldom feel disposed to take time to reply to personal criticisms; but as you are an old and valued friend who had no thought of criticism but who simply wished to be in a position to answer an inquiry, I am very glad indeed to write you this letter.

Affectionately yours,

January 17, 1924.
Dictated 14th.

The Rev. J.L. Weaver, D.D.,
Rocky Ford, Colo.

My dear Dr. Weaver,

I am glad to write at the earliest opportunity in response to your letter of January 5th, and in reply, as far as possible, to its inquiries.

1. I think it is true that there has been very little increase in administrative expenses. The consolidation of our Board with the Woman's Board will make it appear, of course, that there has been a large increase, as the Woman's Board has always heretofore handled its administrative expenses separately. But adding together the administrative expenses of our Foreign Missionary work prior to the consolidation I think it is true that the expenses now are little in advance of those of last year or the year before. It is altogether true that the deficit is not due to increase of administrative expense. Indeed there are those who hold that the way to prevent deficits is to increase your expenditures on promotion and publicity. Perhaps we have erred in not doing enough of this.

2. It is impossible to say how many givers have withheld their gifts "because of the loose teaching of certain missionaries and the actions of certain members of the Board." The churches which have written in that they were withholding their gifts have been churches that were giving very little. There have been some larger churches that have disapproved of Dr. Alexander, but they have recognized that the right way to deal with such questions was not to withhold gifts from the authorized agency of the Assembly nor to resort to the method of financial coercion. Some people have told us they were withdrawing their gifts when, as a matter of fact, we knew that they were not making any gifts to the Board. I wish we could calculate just how many people were withholding or reducing. We will try to do this, but it is well nigh impossible. What we can say is that all such withdrawals have thus far been far more than offset by increased gifts. It would seem that the great body of the Church trusted its foreign missionary work and was absolutely loyal to it.

3. I do not think that anybody has withheld funds "because of the loose teaching of certain missionaries." They may have withheld because they heard of reports of such teaching, but we have not yet been able to get any such evidence of the fact of such teaching by any of our missionaries. Professor Robert Dick Wilson, with whom we have conferred, said that he knows of none on the part of our Presbyterian missionaries. Dr. Scott of Shantung, who was cited by the Editor of the Sunday-School Times, as one able to give evidence of unsound teaching, explicitly stated when a Committee of our Board conferred with him, that he did not know one of our Church's missionaries who was disloyal or unfaithful. There has been a great deal of loose and unchristian talk about the missionaries but we have been unable to locate any of the unfaithfulness which has been so easily charged, and we have followed up every such charge that we have heard of.

1/14/24

4. The second paragraph of the Board's statement, I think, is not misleading. It affirms that the Board and its members and officers clearly realize what their trust is, and have sought to be scrupulously true to it. I judge, however, that your question refers to the personal views of Dr. Alexander and perhaps Dr. Merrill. I enclose herewith some correspondence between them, and a minister in Ewing Presbytery, Illinois, in which they specifically set forth their views.

5. The paragraph regarding the New York Presbytery to which you refer was merely meant to clear away the misapprehension of those who think that because the Board is located in New York City therefore it is within the jurisdiction or influence of New York Presbytery. As to the Board's being liable for what each one of its members may say or do, altogether apart from his membership in the Board, would you apply the same principle to the Board of Directors of Princeton Theological Seminary, of which Dr. George Alexander is the oldest member, and to which he was recently reelected, and where he is a fellow member with Dr. Maitland Alexander, Dr. Fox, Dr. McCartney and many others.

6. It is a mistake to think that the Boards are self perpetuating. The Board of Foreign Missions does not nominate its own members. Many years ago it did so, but that practice was given up, and the Assembly is absolutely free each year, with no suggestions whatever from the Board, to fill up the outgoing class. The Committee on Consolidation asked each one of the component elements of the Board, as now constituted, to make suggestions, but that was altogether exceptional, and when at the coming meeting of the Assembly a third of the members complete their term, the Assembly will have absolute power, without suggestion from the Board, with regard to filling their places.

7. Your last question raises the inquiry which is often discussed as to whether there ought to be periodical reaffirmation of vows on the part of ministers and elders as there is, I believe, on the part of some teachers? There are some who are proposing now that for certain offices in the Church men should be required to reaffirm, and there are others who think that if there is to be any reaffirmation it ought to be made applicable to everyone. Whether this would make such affirmation more serious and binding is doubtful in the minds of still others.

If I have not fully covered all the inquiries in your mind, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Very sincerely yours,

R. E. Speer

December 10, 1923.

The Rev. Charles H. Scott, D.D.,
C/o Rev. H. G. Rawson,
Ardmore, Pennsylvania.

Dear Dr. Scott:

This morning's mail brings your letter of December 5 which I have read with deep interest. Some of the questions which you ask belong to the department of the Executive Secretary for the Shantung Mission rather than to me, and others, I think, had better await your conference with the Committee of the Board next Monday, the 17th. That is the most practicable time for the members of the Committee. It has some other matters to consider, however, which do not involve your personal presence, and if it will be more convenient for you to come at half past eleven you may do so and the Committee will consider its other matters before you come.

I may only say now that you will find light thrown upon your question regarding the extension of your furlough by reading the enclosed copy of "Extracts from Board Actions and Letters on Ante-dating and Extending Furloughs". Please note particularly the marked passages. The Board does not consider opportunities to make missionary addresses as a reason for keeping missionaries back from their fields. Very serious depletion of the working force on the field would be involved as scores of missionaries who are effective on the platform are sought in that way every year.

Your question as to whether the Board will "allow no appeal at all for the North China Theological Seminary", I can only answer by referring you to the action of your own Mission that was quoted to you in my letter to you of November 26, to the fact that the China Council has not asked the Board for financial help from America, and to the Manual which stipulates that appeals should be made only for objects authorized by the Missions and the Board - a Manual rule which with others was approved by the Post War Conference with Missionaries and whose findings were afterwards approved by your own Mission. Of course it may be that when the Minutes of the last annual meeting of the China Council arrive they will include some recommendation on the subject, and if they do the matter will then be reopened.

Your further question whether the Board "will agree to the Shantung Mission assigning a third man to that N.C.T. Seminary" is one that cannot be answered unless and until the Mission and the China Council shall officially ask an action of the Board on the subject. We can simply deal now with the fact that no such official action from the field is before us.

The postscript of your letter gives further illustration of some of the difficulties that are involved. You say that "influential business men -elders- have repeatedly asked me (you) why the Board objects to funds being given to the N.C.T. Seminary, why the Board itself does not boom that Seminary". How did these "influential business men-elders" get such an impression? The Board has published nothing on the subject. Manifestly, some missionary or missionaries connected with the Seminary have said or written things that have given that impression in spite of the plain action of the Shantung Mission and the plain rule of the Manual.

The action of the North China Synod, a copy of which you enclose, is not only interesting but valuable inasmuch as it points to the proper and only proper way of dealing with reports of this kind. You will note that it appointed "a committee to examine within a month the theological teaching of these institutions and in case of finding such unorthodox teaching to report the same to the Rev. J. W. Lowrie and to report to the Board of Foreign Missions in New York". Precisely. Surely then every consideration of wisdom and common fairness and Christian courtesy and justice to the cause should lead to silence on the part of all concerned until Dr. Lowrie's report as Chairman of the China Council shall have been received and acted upon. To spread reports among the home churches that there are "unorthodox teaching" in these institutions is to beg the whole question in advance of its consideration and report by the bodies that alone have authority to deal with it.

I wish to say with all possible emphasis that the Board has never agreed to support a "liberal theological seminary" nor has the Board ever opposed a "conservative" one either in China or anywhere else. The Board has simply cooperated with the Missions concerned in supporting the seminaries that the missions themselves have largely been instrumental in forming and which the missions have asked the Board to support. Our course in the present instance, therefore, has nothing whatever to do with the type of theology that is represented by either the North China Union Seminary or the seminaries in connection with the Shantung and Peking Christian Universities. You, yourself, have stated that the Shantung Mission is a strongly evangelical body; manifestly, therefore, we in the Board cannot assume that the seminary that it has asked the Board to support is unsound.

However, when I started I had no intention of writing such a lengthy letter. I have, of course, showed your letter to my colleague and your Secretary, Dr. George T. Scott, and in accordance with your request I return the Rev. Dr. W. B. Jennings' letter to you of November 12.

I am exceedingly sorry, my dear Dr. Scott, that I am obliged to write you in these ways. You will bear me witness that our personal relations have been not only most friendly but most cordial ever since you went to the field. I remember with keen pleasure our visits with you and Mrs. Scott in Shantung and I recognize your marked ability and effectiveness as a speaker and writer. I am sure that you will take into consideration the

Dr. Scott.

-3-

fact that the solicitude that we in the Board are manifesting in the questions now under consideration is not in our own interests but in the interest of the missionaries and the work on the field. You, of course, know how really desperate their needs are. What an unspeakable calamity it would be if the budget for the year and the deficit now resting on the Board cannot be met! Anything that tends to divert gifts from the objects which the Missions themselves have asked us to provide in the guaranteed budget and, particularly, any statements that tend to lessen the confidence of givers in the home churches in the fidelity and evangelical soundness of the missionary body and the Board are calculated to do irreparable damage to the cause of Christ. It is because that we want to work with the missionaries for the furtherance of the cause to which they have consecrated their lives that we are distressed by the circulation of harmful reports.

Cordially yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

ENC.

AJB:K

December 10, 1923.

The Rev. Charles H. Scott, D.D.,
C/o Rev. E. G. Rawson,
Ardmore, Pennsylvania.

Dear Dr. Scott:

This morning's mail brings your letter of December 5 which I have read with deep interest. Some of the questions which you ask belong to the department of the Executive Secretary for the Shantung Mission rather than to me, and others, I think, had better await your conference with the Committee of the Board next Monday, the 17th. That is the most practicable time for the members of the Committee. It has some other matters to consider, however, which do not involve your personal presence, and if it will be more convenient for you to come at half past eleven you may do so and the Committee will consider its other matters before you come.

I may only say now that you will find light thrown upon your question regarding the extension of your furlough by reading the enclosed copy of "Extracts from Board Actions and Letters on Ante-dating and Extending Furloughs". Please note particularly the marked passages. The Board does not consider opportunities to make missionary addresses as a reason for keeping missionaries back from their fields. Very serious depletion of the working force on the field would be involved as scores of missionaries who are effective on the platform are sought in that way every year.

Your question as to whether the Board will "allow no appeal at all for the North China Theological Seminary", I can only answer by referring you to the action of your own Mission that was quoted to you in my letter to you of November 26, to the fact that the China Council has not asked the Board for financial help from America, and to the Manual which stipulates that appeals should be made only for objects authorized by the Missions and the Board - a Manual rule which with others was approved by the Post War Conference with Missionaries and whose findings were afterwards approved by your own Mission. Of course it may be that when the Minutes of the last annual meeting of the China Council arrive they will include some recommendation on the subject, and if they do the matter will then be reopened.

Your further question whether the Board "will agree to the Shantung Mission assigning a third man to that N.C.T. Seminary" is one that cannot be answered unless and until the Mission and the China Council shall officially ask an action of the Board on the subject. We can simply deal now with the fact that no such official action from the field is before us.

The postscript of your letter gives further illustration of some of the difficulties that are involved. You say that "influential business men -elders- have repeatedly asked me (you) why the Board objects to funds being given to the N.C.T. Seminary, why the Board itself does not boom that Seminary". How did these "influential business men-elders" get such an impression? The Board has published nothing on the subject. Manifestly, some missionary or missionaries connected with the Seminary have said or written things that have given that impression in spite of the plain action of the Shantung Mission and the plain rule of the Manual.

The action of the North China Synod, a copy of which you enclose, is not only interesting but valuable inasmuch as it points to the proper and only proper way of dealing with reports of this kind. You will note that it appointed "a committee to examine within a month the theological teaching of these institutions and in case of finding such unorthodox teaching to report the same to the Rev. J. W. Lowrie and to report to the Board of Foreign Missions in New York". Precisely. Surely then every consideration of wisdom and common fairness and Christian courtesy and justice to the cause should lead to silence on the part of all concerned until Dr. Lowrie's report as Chairman of the China Council shall have been received and acted upon. To spread reports among the home churches that there are "unorthodox teaching" in these institutions is to beg the whole question in advance of its consideration and report by the bodies that alone have authority to deal with it.

I wish to say with all possible emphasis that the Board has never agreed to support a "liberal theological seminary" nor has the Board ever opposed a "conservative" one either in China or anywhere else. The Board has simply cooperated with the Missions concerned in supporting the seminaries that the missions themselves have largely been instrumental in forming and which the missions have asked the Board to support. Our course in the present instance, therefore, has nothing whatever to do with the type of theology that is represented by either the North China Union Seminary or the seminaries in connection with the Shantung and Peking Christian Universities. You, yourself, have stated that the Shantung Mission is a strongly evangelical body; manifestly, therefore, we in the Board cannot assume that the seminary that it has asked the Board to support is unsound.

However, when I started I had no intention of writing such a lengthy letter. I have, of course, showed your letter to my colleague and your Secretary, Dr. George T. L. Scott, and in accordance with your request I return the Rev. Dr. W. B. Jennings' letter to you of November 12.

I am exceedingly sorry, my dear Dr. Scott, that I am obliged to write you in these ways. You will bear me witness that our personal relations have been not only most friendly but most cordial ever since you went to the field. I remember with keen pleasure our visits with you and Mrs. Scott in Shantung and I recognize your marked ability and effectiveness as a speaker and writer. I am sure that you will take into consideration the

Dr. Scott.

-2-

fact that the solicitude that we in the Board are manifesting in the questions now under consideration is not in our own interests but in the interest of the missionaries and the work on the field. You, of course, know how really desperate their needs are. What an unspeakable calamity it would be if the budget for the year and the deficit now resting on the Board cannot be met! Anything that tends to divert gifts from the objects which the Missions themselves have asked us to provide in the guaranteed budget and, particularly, any statements that tend to lessen the confidence of givers in the home churches in the fidelity and evangelical soundness of the missionary body and the Board are calculated to do irreparable damage to the cause of Christ. It is because that we want to work with the missionaries for the furtherance of the cause to which they have consecrated their lives that we are distressed by the circulation of harmful reports.

Cordially yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

ENC.

Extra copies

November 26, 1923.

The Rev. Charles E. Scott, D.D.,
c/o Rev. E. G. Rawson,
Ardmore, Penn.

Dear Dr. Scott:

I wonder if we made our points sufficiently clear in our conference with the members of the Executive Council this morning. In order to make sure, and also in order to serve your convenience in preparing for the further interview which it was agreed that we should have, I write as follows:

1. The action of the Shantung Mission at its annual meeting in 1921 on the North China Union Theological Seminary was as follows: "That the Mission favors the continuance of the present Presbyterian Theological School now at Weihsien, it being understood that the Board is not asked to provide funds for the plant needed in removal elsewhere."

This gave us the impression that the institution was to be financed in China without appeal to America. This impression is confirmed by the fact that neither the Mission nor the China Council has ever asked the Board to raise money in America for that Seminary, but, on the contrary, has asked the Board to continue to support the union Seminary in connection with the University, the vote of the Mission on this subject being as follows:

"That the Mission continue to maintain its connection with the theological department of the Shantung University and to continue to support the same in faculty and finance." Accordingly, unless and until the China Council shall place the Union Theological Seminary in its regular estimates to be provided for in the regular budget, in the same way as other institutions and work are provided for, appeals in America for it are unauthorized.

2. Paragraph 52 of the Manual specifically prohibits special appeals in America for objects that are not included in the regular budget and not authorized by the Board. There is special reason for adhering to this rule now in view of the heavy deficit and our anxiety lest the present budget may not be maintained. Please note what is said on this subject in the attached copy of Board letter No. 635 of November 21, to the Chosen Mission.

3. Not only have the principles stated in the preceding paragraph been violated by the appeals that are being made for the North China Union Seminary, but most seriously of all, those appeals are based on allegations that the reason for the existence of the Seminary is "dissatisfaction with conditions formerly existing", and "a demand for a school under the control of the Chinese Church which should be strictly bible honoring and conservative in its teachings". Not only does this make by necessary implication a serious reflection upon the other union theological seminaries but you specifically stated in the note which you wrote across the top of the printed leaflet that is being circulated in this country that "this Seminary is a protest against rationalistic teach-

ings by our missionaries in the union theological seminaries of our Missions in China". We were very glad to hear your statement that you should not have used the word "our" in connection with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, but you did state that there is "rationalistic teaching" by missionaries of other denominations of the four of the union theological seminaries with which our Missions cooperate, namely, Peking, Tsinan-fu, Nanking and Hangchow.

Our Board stands squarely, unreservedly and unequivocally for a sound evangelical gospel as that gospel is held by the Presbyterian Church. Please note the clear strong statement to this effect in the attached leaflet entitled, "Statement Regarding the Evangelical Loyalty of the Board of Foreign Missions and the Missionaries", which was unanimously adopted by the Board November 19. Now if there is contrary teaching in any union theological seminary with which our Missions cooperate, our Board will not stand for it, and, to quote from sub-section 5 of the Statement just referred to: "Whenever difficulties and problems doctrinal or otherwise arise in connection with these institutions, it is the policy and purpose of the Board to take them up with the institution concerned and the boards of the other denominations associated in it. If agreement cannot be reached on a strict evangelical basis, the Board will recommend withdrawal from further participation." All we ask is that any missionary who believes that there is unevangelical teaching in any of these seminaries should give us the evidence on which he bases his belief. You have told others, and you told us this morning, that this is your belief. We are as profoundly concerned about this as you or any one else can be. We do not wish to embarrass you or put you in a hole. Our whole thought is that in the interest of the cause of Christ we want such a statement of the facts as will enable us to deal with them. Statements that you and other missionaries are alleged to have made to this effect are being made the basis of the hostile propaganda against the Board and the missionary cause in China by two weekly papers and by some presbyteries which have made or are considering the making of overtures to the General Assembly on the subject.

In these circumstances, is it not fair and right that you should state to the Board the grounds of your accusation, and that pending reasonable opportunity for investigation and the taking of such action as that investigation may justify, no criticism should be made to people in the home churches and every effort should be made to correct any wrong impression that has already been made?

You will note therefore that all that we are asking of you is that if, as you allege, there is anything seriously wrong we invite you to cooperate with the Board in remedying it at once.

You will see that these questions have nothing whatever to do with the Bible Union in China nor with the type of theology and biblical interpretation that is taught in the North China Union Theological Seminary. Our Board has taken no action unfavorable to the Bible Union in China, nor has it the slightest objection to the type of theology taught in the Seminary. As for the policy of union, that is not only the policy of the Board but the policy of all the Missions in China and of all our Missions throughout the world, and the repeatedly declared policy of the General Assembly. If your Mission wants that policy changed,

it should so declare itself in official action through the China Council. But what we are now discussing is neither that policy, nor the Bible Union, nor "a type" of theology. We are dealing simply and solely with appeals to the home constituency for an object unauthorized either by the China Council or the Board with statements that, to the extent that they are believed, tend to destroy confidence in the Board and therefore undermine the support not only of a few institutions but of the whole missionary work in China.

You may be sure that we are prepared to go into the question of evidence without any presupposition whatever except a desire to maintain the truth.

I may add that I have showed this letter to the secretaries of your Mission, Mrs. Roys and Dr. Scott, and they concurred.

Cordially yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

P.S. Perhaps I should add that you may feel that there is a distinction between asking the Board "to provide funds for the plant" and asking individual donors in America. I am sure, however, that you will feel on reflection that no such distinction is proper. The Board is the only agency constituted by the General Assembly to administer foreign missionary gifts of the Presbyterian Church, its constituency is the entire membership of the Church, the only resources of the Board consist of all the money that the churches and their subsidiary organizations and individual members can be induced to give. It would be quite out of the question for the Board at the beginning of a fiscal year to guarantee over four million dollars to missionaries for their support and the support of their work unless the Board can administer the gifts which are the Board's sole dependence for meeting that guarantee, nor could the Board acquiesce in having a missionary depend upon that budget for his own support and that of his family and the work of his mission and at the same time be free to forage among the churches for supplementary gifts, especially as in this case where the separate appeal is based upon considerations which tend to undermine the confidence of donors in the regular work.

November 26, 1923.

The Rev. Charles E. Scott, D.D.,
c/o Rev. E. G. Rawson,
Ardmore, Penn.

Dear Dr. Scott:

I wonder if we made our points sufficiently clear in our conference with the members of the Executive Council this morning. In order to make sure, and also in order to serve your convenience in preparing for the further interview which it was agreed that we should have, I write as follows:

1. The action of the Shantung Mission at its annual meeting in 1921 on the North China Union Theological Seminary was as follows: "That the Mission favors the continuance of the present Presbyterian Theological School now at Weihsien, it being understood that the Board is not asked to provide funds for the plant needed in removal elsewhere."

This gave us the impression that the institution was to be financed in China without appeal to America. This impression is confirmed by the fact that neither the Mission nor the China Council has ever asked the Board to raise money in America for that Seminary, but, on the contrary, has asked the Board to continue to support the union Seminary in connection with the University, the vote of the Mission on this subject being as follows:

"That the Mission continue to maintain its connection with the theological department of the Shantung University and to continue to support the same in faculty and finance." Accordingly, unless and until the China Council shall place the Union Theological Seminary in its regular estimates to be provided for in the regular budget, in the same way as other institutions and work are provided for, appeals in America for it are unauthorized.

2. Paragraph 52 of the Manual specifically prohibits special appeals in America for objects that are not included in the regular budget and not authorized by the Board. There is special reason for adhering to this rule now in view of the heavy deficit and our anxiety lest the present budget may not be maintained. Please note what is said on this subject in the attached copy of Board letter No. 635 of November 21, to the Chosen Mission.

3. Not only have the principles stated in the preceding paragraph been violated by the appeals that are being made for the North China Union Seminary, but most seriously of all, those appeals are based on allegations that the reason for the existence of the Seminary is "dissatisfaction with conditions formerly existing", and "a demand for a school under the control of the Chinese Church which should be strictly bible honoring and conservative in its teachings". Not only does this make by necessary implication a serious reflection upon the other union theological seminaries but you specifically stated in the note which you wrote across the top of the printed leaflet that is being circulated in this country that "this Seminary is a protest against rationalistic teach-

ings by our missionaries in the union theological seminaries of our Missions in China". We were very glad to hear your statement that you should not have used the word "our" in connection with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, but you did state that there is "rationalistic teaching" by missionaries of other denominations of the four of the union theological seminaries with which our Missions cooperate, namely, Peking, Tsinan-fu, Nanking and Hangchow.

Our Board stands squarely, unreservedly and unequivocally for a sound evangelical gospel as that gospel is held by the Presbyterian Church. Please note the clear strong statement to this effect in the attached leaflet entitled, "Statement Regarding the Evangelical Loyalty of the Board of Foreign Missions and the Missionaries", which was unanimously adopted by the Board November 19. Now if there is contrary teaching in any union theological seminary with which our Missions cooperate, our Board will not stand for it, and, to quote from sub-section 5 of the Statement just referred to: "Whenever difficulties and problems doctrinal or otherwise arise in connection with these institutions, it is the policy and purpose of the Board to take them up with the institution concerned and the boards of the other denominations associated in it. If agreement cannot be reached on a strict evangelical basis, the Board will recommend withdrawal from further participation." All we ask is that any missionary who believes that there is unevangelical teaching in any of these seminaries should give us the evidence on which he bases his belief. You have told others, and you told us this morning, that this is your belief. We are as profoundly concerned about this as you or any one else can be. We do not wish to embarrass you or put you in a hole. Our whole thought is that in the interest of the cause of Christ we want such a statement of the facts as will enable us to deal with them. Statements that you and other missionaries are alleged to have made to this effect are being made the basis of the hostile propaganda against the Board and the missionary cause in China by two weekly papers and by some presbyteries which have made or are considering the making of overtures to the General Assembly on the subject.

In these circumstances, is it not fair and right that you should state to the Board the grounds of your accusation, and that pending reasonable opportunity for investigation and the taking of such action as that investigation may justify, no criticism should be made to people in the home churches and every effort should be made to correct any wrong impression that has already been made?

You will note therefore that all that we are asking of you is that if, as you allege, there is anything seriously wrong we invite you to cooperate with the Board in remedying it at once.

You will see that these questions have nothing whatever to do with the Bible Union in China nor with the type of theology and biblical interpretation that is taught in the North China Union Theological Seminary. Our Board has taken no action unfavorable to the Bible Union in China, nor has it the slightest objection to the type of theology taught in the Seminary. As for the policy of union, that is not only the policy of the Board but the policy of all the Missions in China and of all our Missions throughout the world, and the repeatedly declared policy of the General Assembly. If your Mission wants that policy changed,

it should so declare itself in official action through the China Council. But what we are now discussing is neither that policy, nor the Bible Union, nor "a type" of theology. We are dealing simply and solely with appeals to the home constituency for an object unauthorized either by the China Council or the Board with statements that, to the extent that they are believed, tend to destroy confidence in the Board and therefore undermine the support not only of a few institutions but of the whole missionary work in China.

You may be sure that we are prepared to go into the question of evidence without any presupposition whatever except a desire to maintain the truth.

I may add that I have showed this letter to the secretaries of your Mission, Mrs. Roys and Dr. Scott, and they concurred.

Cordially yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

P.S. Perhaps I should add that you may feel that there is a distinction between asking the Board "to provide funds for the plant" and asking individual donors in America. I am sure, however, that you will feel on reflection that no such distinction is proper. The Board is the only agency constituted by the General Assembly to administer foreign missionary gifts of the Presbyterian Church, its constituency is the entire membership of the Church, the only resources of the Board consist of all the money that the churches and their subsidiary organizations and individual members can be induced to give. It would be quite out of the question for the Board at the beginning of a fiscal year to guarantee over four million dollars to missionaries for their support and the support of their work unless the Board can administer the gifts which are the Board's sole dependence for meeting that guarantee, nor could the Board acquiesce in having a missionary depend upon that budget for his own support and that of his family and the work of his mission and at the same time be free to forage among the churches for supplementary gifts, especially as in this case where the separate appeal is based upon considerations which tend to undermine the confidence of donors in the regular work.

November 26, 1923.

The Rev. Charles E. Scott, D.D.,
c/o Rev. H. G. Rawson,
Ardmore, Penn.

Dear Dr. Scott:

I wonder if we made our points sufficiently clear in our conference with the members of the Executive Council this morning. In order to make sure, and also in order to serve your convenience in preparing for the further interview which it was agreed that we should have, I write as follows:

1. The action of the Shantung Mission at its annual meeting in 1921 on the North China Union Theological Seminary was as follows: "That the Mission favors the continuance of the present Presbyterian Theological School now at Weihaiien, it being understood that the Board is not asked to provide funds for the plant needed in removal elsewhere."

This gave us the impression that the institution was to be financed in China without appeal to America. This impression is confirmed by the fact that neither the Mission nor the China Council has ever asked the Board to raise money in America for that Seminary, but, on the contrary, has asked the Board to continue to support the union Seminary in connection with the University, the vote of the Mission on this subject being as follows:

"That the Mission continue to maintain its connection with the theological department of the Shantung University and to continue to support the same in faculty and finance." Accordingly, unless and until the China Council shall place the Union Theological Seminary in its regular estimates to be provided for in the regular budget, in the same way as other institutions and work are provided for, appeals in America for it are unauthorized.

2. Paragraph 52 of the Manual specifically prohibits special appeals in America for objects that are not included in the regular budget and not authorized by the Board. There is special reason for adhering to this rule now in view of the heavy deficit and our anxiety lest the present budget may not be maintained. Please note what is said on this subject in the attached copy of Board letter No. 635 of November 21, to the Chosen Mission.

3. Not only have the principles stated in the preceding paragraph been violated by the appeals that are being made for the North China Union Seminary, but most seriously of all, those appeals are based on allegations that the reason for the existence of the Seminary is "dissatisfaction with conditions formerly existing", and "a demand for a school under the control of the Chinese Church which should be strictly bible honoring and conservative in its teachings". Not only does this make by necessary implication a serious reflection upon the other union theological seminaries but you specifically stated in the note which you wrote across the top of the printed leaflet that is being circulated in this country that "this Seminary is a protest against rationalistic teach-

ings by our missionaries in the union theological seminaries of our Missions in China". We were very glad to hear your statement that you should not have used the word "our" in connection with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, but you did state that there is "rationalistic teaching" by missionaries of other denominations of the four of the union theological seminaries with which our Missions cooperate, namely, Peking, Tsinan-fu, Nanking and Hangchow.

Our Board stands squarely, unreservedly and unequivocally for a sound evangelical gospel as that gospel is held by the Presbyterian Church. Please note the clear strong statement to this effect in the attached leaflet entitled, "Statement Regarding the Evangelical Loyalty of the Board of Foreign Missions and the Missionaries", which was unanimously adopted by the Board November 19. Now if there is contrary teaching in any union theological seminary with which our Missions cooperate, our Board will not stand for it, and, to quote from sub-section 5 of the Statement just referred to: "Whenever difficulties and problems doctrinal or otherwise arise in connection with these institutions, it is the policy and purpose of the Board to take them up with the institution concerned and the boards of the other denominations associated in it. If agreement cannot be reached on a strict evangelical basis, the Board will recommend withdrawal from further participation." All we ask is that any missionary who believes that there is unevangelical teaching in any of these seminaries should give us the evidence on which he bases his belief. You have told others, and you told us this morning, that this is your belief. We are as profoundly concerned about this as you or any one else can be. We do not wish to embarrass you or put you in a hole. Our whole thought is that in the interest of the cause of Christ we want such a statement of the facts as will enable us to deal with them. Statements that you and other missionaries are alleged to have made to this effect are being made the basis of the hostile propaganda against the Board and the missionary cause in China by two weekly papers and by some presbyteries which have made or are considering the making of overtures to the General Assembly on the subject.

In these circumstances, is it not fair and right that you should state to the Board the grounds of your accusation, and that pending reasonable opportunity for investigation and the taking of such action as that investigation may justify, no criticism should be made to people in the home churches and every effort should be made to correct any wrong impression that has already been made?

You will note therefore that all that we are asking of you is that if, as you allege, there is anything seriously wrong we invite you to cooperate with the Board in remedying it at once.

You will see that these questions have nothing whatever to do with the Bible Union in China nor with the type of theology and biblical interpretation that is taught in the North China Union Theological Seminary. Our Board has taken no action unfavorable to the Bible Union in China, nor has it the slightest objection to the type of theology taught in the Seminary. As for the policy of union, that is not only the policy of the Board but the policy of all the Missions in China and of all our Missions throughout the world, and the repeatedly declared policy of the General Assembly. If your Mission wants that policy changed,

it should so declare itself in official action through the China Council. But what we are now discussing is neither that policy, nor the Bible Union, nor "a type" of theology. We are dealing simply and solely with appeals to the home constituency for an object unauthorized either by the China Council or the Board with statements that, to the extent that they are believed, tend to destroy confidence in the Board and therefore undermine the support not only of a few institutions but of the whole missionary work in China.

You may be sure that we are prepared to go into the question of evidence without any presupposition whatever except a desire to maintain the truth.

I may add that I have showed this letter to the secretaries of your Mission, Mrs. Reys and Dr. Scott, and they concurred.

Cordially yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

P.S. Perhaps I should add that you may feel that there is a distinction between asking the Board "to provide funds for the plant" and asking individual donors in America. I am sure, however, that you will feel on reflection that no such distinction is proper. The Board is the only agency constituted by the General Assembly to administer foreign missionary gifts of the Presbyterian Church, its constituency is the entire membership of the Church, the only resources of the Board consist of all the money that the churches and their subsidiary organizations and individual members can be induced to give. It would be quite out of the question for the Board at the beginning of a fiscal year to guarantee over four million dollars to missionaries for their support and the support of their work unless the Board can administer the gifts which are the Board's sole dependence for meeting that guarantee, nor could the Board acquiesce in having a missionary depend upon that budget for his own support and that of his family and the work of his mission and at the same time be free to forage among the churches for supplementary gifts, especially as in this case where the separate appeal is based upon considerations which tend to undermine the confidence of donors in the regular work.

November 26, 1928.

The Rev. Charles E. Scott, D.D.,
c/o Rev. E. G. Rawson,
Ardmore, Penn.

Dear Dr. Scott:

I wonder if we made our points sufficiently clear in our conference with the members of the Executive Council this morning. In order to make sure, and also in order to serve your convenience in preparing for the further interview which it was agreed that we should have, I write as follows:

1. The action of the Shantung Mission at its annual meeting in 1921 on the North China Union Theological Seminary was as follows: "That the Mission favors the continuance of the present Presbyterian Theological School now at Weihai, it being understood that the Board is not asked to provide funds for the plant needed in removal elsewhere."

This gave us the impression that the institution was to be financed in China without appeal to America. This impression is confirmed by the fact that neither the Mission nor the China Council has ever asked the Board to raise money in America for that Seminary, but, on the contrary, has asked the Board to continue to support the union Seminary in connection with the University, the vote of the Mission on this subject being as follows:

"That the Mission continue to maintain its connection with the theological department of the Shantung University and to continue to support the same in faculty and finance." Accordingly, unless and until the China Council shall place the Union Theological Seminary in its regular estimates to be provided for in the regular budget, in the same way as other institutions and work are provided for, appeals in America for it are unauthorized.

2. Paragraph 52 of the Manual specifically prohibits special appeals in America for objects that are not included in the regular budget and not authorized by the Board. There is special reason for adhering to this rule now in view of the heavy deficit and our anxiety lest the present budget may not be maintained. Please note what is said on this subject in the attached copy of Board letter No. 635 of November 21, to the Chosen Mission.

3. Not only have the principles stated in the preceding paragraph been violated by the appeals that are being made for the North China Union Seminary, but most seriously of all, those appeals are based on allegations that the reason for the existence of the Seminary is "dissatisfaction with conditions formerly existing", and "a demand for a school under the control of the Chinese Church which should be strictly bible honoring and conservative in its teachings". Not only does this make by necessary implication a serious reflection upon the other union theological seminaries but you specifically stated in the note which you wrote across the top of the printed leaflet that is being circulated in this country that "this Seminary is a protest against rationalistic teach-

ings by our missionaries in the union theological seminaries of our Missions in China". We were very glad to hear your statement that you should not have used the word "our" in connection with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, but you did state that there is "rationalistic teaching" by missionaries of other denominations of the four of the union theological seminaries with which our Missions cooperate, namely, Peking, Tainan-fu, Nanking and Hangehow.

Our Board stands squarely, unreservedly and unequivocally for a sound evangelical gospel as that gospel is held by the Presbyterian Church. Please note the clear strong statement to this effect in the attached leaflet entitled, "Statement Regarding the Evangelical Loyalty of the Board of Foreign Missions and the Missionaries", which was unanimously adopted by the Board November 19. Now if there is contrary teaching in any union theological seminary with which our Missions cooperate, our Board will not stand for it, and, to quote from sub-section 5 of the Statement just referred to: "Whenever difficulties and problems doctrinal or otherwise arise in connection with these institutions, it is the policy and purpose of the Board to take them up with the institution concerned and the boards of the other denominations associated in it. If agreement cannot be reached on a strict evangelical basis, the Board will recommend withdrawal from further participation." All we ask is that any missionary who believes that there is unevangelical teaching in any of these seminaries should give us the evidence on which he bases his belief. You have told others, and you told us this morning, that this is your belief. We are as profoundly concerned about this as you or any one else can be. We do not wish to embarrass you or put you in a hole. Our whole thought is that in the interest of the cause of Christ we want such a statement of the facts as will enable us to deal with them. Statements that you and other missionaries are alleged to have made to this effect are being made the basis of the hostile propaganda against the Board and the missionary cause in China by two weekly papers and by some presbyteries which have made or are considering the making of overtures to the General Assembly on the subject.

In these circumstances, is it not fair and right that you should state to the Board the grounds of your accusation, and that pending reasonable opportunity for investigation and the taking of such action as that investigation may justify, no criticism should be made to people in the home churches and every effort should be made to correct any wrong impression that has already been made?

You will note therefore that all that we are asking of you is that if, as you allege, there is anything seriously wrong we invite you to cooperate with the Board in remedying it at once.

You will see that these questions have nothing whatever to do with the Bible Union in China nor with the type of theology and biblical interpretation that is taught in the North China Union Theological Seminary. Our Board has taken no action unfavorable to the Bible Union in China, nor has it the slightest objection to the type of theology taught in the Seminary. As for the policy of union, that is not only the policy of the Board but the policy of all the Missions in China and of all our Missions throughout the world, and the repeatedly declared policy of the General Assembly. If your Mission wants that policy changed,

it should so declare itself in official action through the China Council. But what we are now discussing is neither that policy, nor the Bible Union, nor "a type" of theology. We are dealing simply and solely with appeals to the home constituency for an object unauthorized either by the China Council or the Board with statements that, to the extent that they are believed, tend to destroy confidence in the Board and therefore undermine the support not only of a few institutions but of the whole missionary work in China.

You may be sure that we are prepared to go into the question of evidence without any presupposition whatever except a desire to maintain the truth.

I may add that I have showed this letter to the secretaries of your Mission, Mrs. Roys and Dr. Scott, and they concurred.

Cordially yours,

Arthur J. Brown.

P.S. Perhaps I should add that you may feel that there is a distinction between asking the Board "to provide funds for the plant" and asking individual donors in America. I am sure, however, that you will feel on reflection that no such distinction is proper. The Board is the only agency constituted by the General Assembly to administer foreign missionary gifts of the Presbyterian Church, its constituency is the entire membership of the Church, the only resources of the Board consist of all the money that the churches and their subsidiary organizations and individual members can be induced to give. It would be quite out of the question for the Board at the beginning of a fiscal year to guarantee over four million dollars to missionaries for their support and the support of their work unless the Board can administer the gifts which are the Board's sole dependence for meeting that guarantee, nor could the Board acquiesce in having a missionary depend upon that budget for his own support and that of his family and the work of his mission and at the same time be free to forage among the churches for supplementary gifts, especially as in this case where the separate appeal is based upon considerations which tend to undermine the confidence of donors in the regular work.